R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 611 JC 670 075

THE CASE FOR INDEPENDENT JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS, A REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION.

BY- DEWITT, GEORGE E. HALL, LLOYD C.

PUB DATE DEC 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.40 10P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *SCHOOL DISTRICTS, SCHOOL DISTRICT SPENDING, *GOVERNANCE, *ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION, CALIFORNIA, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

MOST CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES ARE ALREADY GOVERNED IN SEPARATE DISTRICTS. THE FEW JUNIOR COLLEGES, HOWEVER, WHICH DO REMAIN IN UNIFIED DISTRICTS ARE LARGE ONES, AND THE ABUSES AND HANDICAPS THEY SUSTAIN ARE MANIFOLD. FUNDS EARMARKED FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAMS ARE BEING DIVERTED TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. UNIFIED DISTRICT BOARD MEMBERS HAVE TO DIVIDE THEIR ATTENTION BETWEEN PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND GRADES K-12. UNIFIED DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS TEND TO IDENTIFY STRONGLY WITH THE SECONDARY LEVEL IN THEIR PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND CURRICULUM POLICIES. ALSO, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY IN A UNIFIED DISTRICT IS AFFECTED BY THE "GRADES-THIRTEEN-AND-FOURTEEN" ORIENTATION OF THE ADMINISTRATORS, MANY OF WHOM HAVE NEVER TAUGHT A COLLEGE CLASS. SUCH ADMINISTRATORS ARE QUITE NATURALLY INCLINED TO "PROMOTE" TEACHERS FROM HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT WHEN NEW INSTRUCTORS ARE NEEDED. FOR THESE REASONS, JUNIOR COLLEGES SHOULD BE INDEPENDENT. THIS ARTICLE WAS PUBLISHED IN "AAUP BULLETIN," VOLUME 51, NUMBER 5, DECEMBER 1965. (AUTHOR/HS)

ED012611

A publication of the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Editor
BERTRAM H. DAVIS

Managing Editor
WARREN C. MIDDLETON

Associate Editors
PHILIP DENENFELD
WINSTON W. EHRMANN
PEGGY HEIM
LOUIS JOUGHIN
HERMAN I. ORENTLICHER
ROBERT VAN WAES

Editorial Committee
SHERIDAN BAKER (English)
University of Michigan
WILLIAM P. FIDLER (English)
Washington Office
RALPH W. GERARD (Physiology)
University of Michigan
BERNARD F. HALEY (Economics)
Stanford University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Warren C. Middleton for
American Assn. of Univ. Professors
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© 1965, American Association of University Professors.

Notice to Contributors: Manuscripts submitted for publication should be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Editorial and Advertising Offices: 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington D. C. 20036. Tel. 202 462-4332. Printed by National Publishing Company. Issued four times a year: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is $3.50 a year, postage free. Single copies, $1.00. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are $4.00 a year. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Advertising rates available upon request.

ERIC

AAUP bulletin

Winter Issue VOL. 51 No. 5 December 1965

Articles

413 Academic Freedom in the South Today, *William P. Fidler*

422 The Case for Independent Junior College Districts, *California Junior College Faculty Association*

429 Education in Legislation and the Courts: A Summary of Recent Developments, *Herman I. Orentlicher*

437 The Compact for Education: A Proposal for Shaping Nationwide Educational Policy, *Herman I. Orentlicher*

Reports and Departments

410 Association Officers and Council

411 Editor's Page

412 Censured Administrations

447 Statement on Academic Freedom of Students

450 Committees of the Association

453 Book Reviews

459 Educational Developments

462 Organizational Notes

465 The Conduct of Business at the Annual Meeting

466 Report of the Audit for 1964

469 Association Membership

470 Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

489 The Discussion of American Foreign Policy

493 Index to Volume 51

JC 670 075

Reprinted From
AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1965
V. 51, n. 4.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LOS ANGELES
JAN 13 1967
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

The Case for Independent Junior College Districts[1]

A REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"The Case for Independent Junior College Districts" has been edited by George E. DeWitt, assisted by Lloyd C. Hall, both members of the faculty of Long Beach City College. Their material has come from many presentations made by chapter members of such supporting organizations as the American Association of University Professors, California State Federation of Teachers, and California Teachers Association, as well as the California Junior College FACULTY Association.

Special recognition is given to Dr. Alice M. Rose of Long Beach, Dr. Richard B. Miller of San Diego, Arthur E. Marshburn of Santa Monica, Donald V. Spagnoli of Glendale, Donald E. Fitzgerald of Long Beach, and many others who have supplied information supporting the need for separation. The permission to excerpt from several articles in the *Junior College Journal*, published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, is likewise gratefully acknowledged.

Ad Hoc Committee on Publication
Kyle Esgate, Santa Monica
Charles M. Newman, San Diego
Donald E. Fitzgerald, Long Beach
Presley C. Dawson, Long Beach, Chairman
California Junior College FACULTY Association
March, 1965

Introduction

History

As everyone knows, California junior colleges began as extensions of high schools, usually sharing the same staff, plant, and services. Few would argue, however, that this beginning was based on sound educational philosophy—or any philosophy at all. Rather, such a development occurred because there was a need to be met, and the existing high school districts could meet it temporarily—at least from a fiscal and administrative point of view. Very little capital outlay or additional plant and services were needed for administering what amounted to an extension of curricular offerings to the "postgraduate" level. If grades ten through twelve could be taught, why not ten through fourteen?

The time, of course, has long passed when we must rely on the lower grades as a base for higher education. The legislature, in passing the Master Plan for Higher Education, made it very clear five years ago (1960) that the junior college is a vital segment of California's tripartite system of higher education. And *any* segment of higher education is too important today to be left to secondary educators. The legislature has made it clear that, contrary to the attitude of most unified-district administrators, the junior college is *not* two more years of high school; it is, among other things, the first two years of a college education.

Recent Progress

In the years since the Master Plan was passed, the junior colleges have rapidly moved toward a full realization of their status as institutions of higher education. It is now illegal for new junior colleges to be established within high school or unified districts. Further, the number of junior colleges in unified districts has diminished to seven, and there is now only one junior college in a high school district. Also, fewer junior college districts are sharing a governing board with secondary-elementary districts.

This movement away from secondary and elementary connections has been reinforced by the unified stand taken by faculty organizations throughout the state. The California Junior College FACULTY Association and the California State Federation of Teachers have been on record since 1960 (the year that the Master Plan was enacted) as favoring independent junior college districts. And now that the California Teachers Association has also adopted a resolution supporting independent districts, state-wide faculty organizations unanimously favor separation. It is especially significant that the American Association of University Professors strongly endorsed separation. During the hearing on AB 2883, the separation bill, a California representative of the AAUP read a telegram from the organization's national headquarters; this message strongly supported separation.

[1] Reprinted by permission.

JC 670 075

Many educational conferences and conventions have also endorsed the concept of independent districts. For example, at a special conference on Junior College Issues, called by the Coordinating Council on Higher Education, the participants voted overwhelmingly in favor of mandating separation.

Also encouraging is the fact that national magazines have become alerted to the plight of junior colleges in unified districts. The consensus of education editors is that the junior college cannot fulfill its role in higher education so long as it is governed by districts primarily concerned with lower education. For example, *Time* magazine (March 5, 1965), in an article on junior colleges, says: ". . . administration of these colleges is shifting away from the regular local school boards to independent college boards—a trend that provides a desirable separation from the high school."

Thus, much progress has already been made toward fully implementing the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. But the spirit, if not the letter, of the Master Plan will continue to be violated so long as some of California's junior colleges remain as stepchildren of secondary-elementary education.[3]

Advantages of Independent Districts

Finance

Some opponents of separation, while admitting that the goals of the Master Plan might best be realized if all junior colleges were independent, maintain that long-range security of the college depends on continued ties with unified districts. Typically, the reverse is the case. Unified districts have used at the elementary and high school levels not only all the proceeds of tax overrides voted for the unified district but have even diverted significant portions of the statutory 35 cent junior college tax. Thereby, financial possibilities are eliminated for the junior college.

The legislature will consider several proposals to put junior colleges on a proper financial footing. If the past is an indication, the legislature cannot be certain that money appropriated will be used for junior colleges in unified districts.

In a working paper for the Coordinating Council, Dr. Henry Tyler, Executive Secretary of the California Junior College Association, assigned a portion of the responsibility for the inadequacy and confusion in state financial support for junior college education to the existence of several types of district organization which maintain junior colleges:

> The fact that junior colleges have been operated by three types of districts—unified, high school and junior college—has limited state-wide data to those from separate junior colleges. Until 1961, there was no requirement that separate records of junior college income and expenditure be kept when the college was maintained by a unified or high school district. The rapid changes now taking place in district organization increase each year the proportion of total junior college information that is available, and the 1961 law requiring separate junior college accounting by those unified and high school districts still maintaining junior colleges is bringing improvement, but the inability to obtain complete income and expenditure data has historically been a serious obstacle to obtaining facts needed for sound appraisal of the junior college financial picture.

At the present time, junior colleges in unified districts are burdened with costs not their own—charged to them by administrators who need or want junior college revenues for secondary and elementary schools. As a result, the junior college in a unified district is charged for "services" it does not use—or it is charged excessively for service it does utilize. The Long Beach Unified School District charges City College with approximately 13 per cent of the cost of most centralized district activities which do not apply exclusively to some other level. Although City College enrollment is approximately 13 per cent of the total district enrollment, City College is charged with 17 per cent of the cost of administering the entire unified district. This percentage amounts to approximately 4.5 per cent of the City College budget, which is about what independent junior college districts spend for administration. Independent districts, however, allot that 4.5 per cent for administrative services performed by individuals who spend *all* of their time and energy on *one* institution —the junior college.

In recent years some lay groups have become increasingly aware of this tendency of the central administration in unified districts to build excessive charges into their junior college budgets. For example, in 1961 a Santa Clara grand jury made the following finding with respect to San Jose City College (as reported in the press):

> City College is not getting its full share of property tax revenue according to jurors . . . If the Unified District finds it impossible to make use of junior college funds because of more urgent need to finance some other program, its control over City College should be brought to an end and a separate junior college district established. . . .

The situation is even more critical at Santa Monica City College, which receives *none* of the tax revenues levied by the unified district. Although the tax levy is based in part on the existence of the City College, all tax monies are applied to the lower grades, leaving the college to subsist on tuition and state income. The situation at Glendale College is not quite as extreme as that at Santa Monica. The following observation on financial practices in the Glendale Unified District appears in the Hawk Report (*Glendale Junior College Study*—conducted by the L.A. County Committee on School District Organization): ". . . it appears that since its inception, the junior college has helped to support the lower levels of the unified district." (p. 23) A similar situation also exists in San Diego, where it takes a tax rate of only 24.3 cents to meet the current expenses of San Diego City College in the Unified District. Yet the actual tax rate levied is 34.2 cents, and that rate is "justified" by the fact that the district contains a junior college! In other words, the district "uses" the junior college to raise revenues, 9.9 cents of which are then spent elsewhere!

[3] In September, 1965, the Board of Directors of the California Junior College Association adopted a resolution in support of the establishment of independent districts with separate boards. Pending state legislation will call for mandatory separation.

In Long Beach the operating tax rate for 1964-65 is approximately 38 cents for junior college expenses. However, the revenue from a 31-cent tax is all that is needed to support the entire junior college program, including adult education. This disparity between the amount needed for junior college purposes and the amount levied means that over one-half million dollars is being raised in local revenue which could not be raised in local revenue if the junior college were not in the district. This junior-college money is being spent elsewhere in the district.

One of the arguments most often set forth by public relations men in unified districts is that junior college education is more expensive in a separate district. This appears to be true, as shown by statistics gathered by the Stanford Research Institute (see the Institute's report, *Financing Public School Education*) and others. A question immediately arises. Is this due to the inherent efficiency of a unified district or due to the nature of the colleges that are in unified districts?

Certainly efficiency is not the answer. If efficiency is to be measured by cost per ADA, the above study reported that it was 3.3 per cent more expensive to educate students in a unified district than in separate districts.

If it is not efficiency, then there must be something in the makeup of the colleges of unified districts that provides the answer. Colleges in unified districts are, with one exception, in large cities. These colleges carry on extensive night programs, allowing such institutions to utilize facilities as much as 50 per cent more with very little additional capital outlay or maintenance cost. These evening programs extensively utilize hourly-paid instructors, who receive less than one half of contract salary. This personnel policy reduces costs appreciably; smaller colleges have no such opportunity to cut instructional expenses. Large-city colleges also carry on extensive day-and-evening summer programs, again paying only hourly rates for some or all instructors. Such colleges also have a higher probability of filling advanced or specialized classes with students, thus using their instructional staff efficiently. Also, unified districts characteristically have a single salary schedule. Such a schedule has the effect of bringing elementary teachers above the state average ($350 in Long Beach) and keeping junior college instructors below average ($400 in Long Beach). Finally, colleges in unified districts are the older two-year institutions which already have routines established, inventories built up, and equipment purchased and installed.

The foregoing, then, are the basic reasons why the cost of junior college education is apparently less in unified districts. None of these reasons is related in any way to the efficiency of the unified-district type of organization. If, for example, Santa Monica City College were in a locally controlled independent district, it would still have all of the economies made possible by the large junior college enrollment; it would still serve the adults of the community in classes for adults; it would still offer an ambitious late afternoon and evening program in liberal arts and technical-vocational areas; it would continue to make effective use of the plant; it could even continue the present salary schedule in effect; it could even make new economies by having a board and administration which concentrated on making the most effective use of the educational dollar at the college level. Further, it could command its fair share of the tax rate now levied in the unified district. As was mentioned earlier, at the present time it receives none of these tax revenues.

Governing Board

The members of the governing board in an independent district can direct all of their time and attention to the problems of the junior college. They can concentrate on—and orient themselves to—*one* level of education, not two or three. Further, the membership on such a board is more homogeneous. All of the members are interested in higher education or they would not offer themselves as candidates for election. In contrast, a joint or unified-district board is comprised of members with varying interests and inclinations. A single member, if any, on the board may be the only one who is particularly interested in the junior college. And even he cannot devote his full-time attention to "grades thirteen and fourteen" merely; he must also make policy for secondary and elementary schools. Typically, he cannot even begin to keep up with the changes, the issues, and the literature involving two or three educational levels. As a result, he tends to accept the recommendations of the secondary administrator who is the superintendent of the unified district.

A broad consensus is developing throughout the state and the nation concerning the deficiencies of unified district boards. For example, in the April, 1962, issue of the *Junior College Journal*, George Hall, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Michigan, addressed himself to the problem in an article entitled, "Confusion in the Control of the Junior College." He lists these advantages to separate boards and administrations for community colleges:

> 1. The rapidly growing public community college needs its own board of control to ensure proper and adequate attention, guidance and development. It is not sufficient for a local school board . . . to devote the last few minutes of a board meeting to the "problems of the junior college."
> 2. It is also highly desirable that a community college should control its own funds through its own business manager to perform its task in the most economical and efficient manner. . . . A well organized community college should handle its own funds where the college faculty and administrative officers prepare the budget and order the expenditures. Because of their closeness to and participation in the budgetary process, they will have far greater interest in this most important aspect of the college operation.

In the same article, Professor Hall quotes from the Commission on Legislation of the American Association of Junior Colleges as follows:

> The administration of the local junior college should not be combined with the administration of a high school or other educational unit . . . It has been found that a junior college will best meet the needs of the local community when the control is under a local board for the community college alone.

In the April, 1963, issue of the *Junior College Journal*, Dr. Clyde E. Blocker, Professor of Junior College Educa-

tion at the University of Texas, wrote on the same problem. He indicated that over 75 per cent of the junior college administrators favor independent junior college districts because of the following difficulties in high school and unified district control:

1. Public school control made it impossible for the board of control to conscientiously consider the problems and developmental program of the college in depth.
2. The person responsible for the college had complete responsibility but limited authority.
3. Budget restrictions were placed upon the college by other segments of the school system.
4. Money appropriations for college use was siphoned oft for other educational programs.
5. There was little budget distinction between the operational costs of the college and other divisions of the school system.
6. The junior college could not establish a separate and distinct identity with the public.

In the September, 1964, issue of the *Junior College Journal,* Sigurd Rislov, Professor of Higher Education at Wayne State University, had this to say in an article entitled "The Board's Responsibility":

> [If] . . . the community college board is also the board of a kindergarten through twelfth grade program, the traditions, policies, practices, customs, folkways, etc., that have grown up around the elementary program cannot be ignored, even though the board may wish to do so in its dealings with the community college. . . . The result is that the community college finds itself, in fact, having its policies determined by the social and organizational values of the kindergarten through the twelfth grade program. This is especially the case when the community college is added to an already established common school program. Even when a common school board makes a special effort to recognize higher education's objectives and policies as distinct from those of the kindergarten through the twelfth grade, it meets with very limited success. Some cultural facts are simply beyond their control.

In November, 1964, Professor Leland Medsker of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, prepared a paper for a seminar on junior college issues conducted under the auspices of the Coordinating Council of Higher Education the body responsible for advising the Legislature on the orderly development of higher education in California. He expressed the following criteria on the governance of junior colleges:

1. Governing agencies of community colleges must not have so many additional responsibilities that the time and energy available for the direction of the community college is beyond the realm of probability.
2. The controlling agency of a community college should be one which can have no conflict of interest between the community college and any other institution for which it is responsible. Its dedication to the unique characteristics of the community college must be unquestioned.
3. Each institution should have its own individuality under a local board, should be autonomous, subject to the minimum standards imposed and enforced by the state.

On January 25, 1965, the staff of the Coordinating Council of Higher Education released a voluminous report on junior college matters. It said:

> The trend toward autonomous local districts is strong. All new junior college districts must be governed by separate boards. The Council staff concurs with the following advisory statement of the seminar:
>
> "It is desirable that all junior colleges be separated promptly from unified or high school districts both in organization and administration. Additional legislation may be necessary to encourage local action."

The staff made the following specific recommendation to the Council:

> That the Council advise the 1965 Legislature to separate all junior colleges from unified or high school districts.

It was in 1959 that the "Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975" was published. It contained this statement:

> A majority of the Survey Team believes that most junior colleges should be operated by boards of their own rather than by unified or high school district boards. The chances of obtaining a faculty of college caliber, students of maturity, and added collegiate prestige appear to be greater when junior colleges are operated by boards of their own.

Administration

In addition to the advantages of having a board of its own, the independent junior college has an administrative staff of its own. In a unified district many members of the central administration staff exercise control over the affairs of the junior college without really understanding or, perhaps, sympathizing with the unique problems of a segment of higher education. The typical central administrator in a unified district has had no college teaching experience—or even any college administration experience. Typically, he rose to central administration from the high schools and elementary schools in the district. His whole background has been in secondary and elementary education. Yet, upon becoming a superintendent or assistant superintendent in a unified district, he suddenly must make decisions and advise his board on problems and policies affecting a segment of higher education —the junior college.

And he is the one who recruits junior college administrators in the district. Logically, he will choose the kind of people he can understand and with whom he can identify. All too often these individuals tend to be administrators who, like the superintendent and his staff, have built their careers in secondary and elementary education. Typically, too, they will tend to have a degree—or perhaps even as many as three degrees—in "education," which is to say that, relatively early in their college careers they made a judgment against working toward an advanced degree in an academic subject. Yet, they have to work with—and understand—instructors who, by law, have at least a master's degree in an academic field. In other words, although the junior college should have as one of its primary aims the training of the intellect, many who have not concerned themselves with academic subjects since their sophomore year in college attempt to function as "deans" and "presidents." This frustrating situation is duplicated in the field of vocational education, one of the areas of major concern in California junior colleges. Here, decisions are not only made by a staff untrained in college matters, but also by administrators who are unaware of the special technical problems of vocational education. In

an independent district, on the other hand, there would be no elementary-secondary central superintendent to recruit college administrators. Instead, the separate college would have the president chosen by a board comprised of members who ran for election because they were specifically concerned with a segment of California higher education—the junior college.

Students—Curriculum

Of course, the quality of the administrative staff does much to set the standards of the college. In unified districts, the administration tends to create a strong secondary-education orientation which influences the course of study and academic standards—and even the quality of instruction. In other words, ultimately, the student does not receive his full measure of higher education in a unified district.

For example, the college curriculum in a unified district is not set by college personnel only. Curriculum proposals characteristically must go "downtown" to the central administrator in charge of the district curriculum. Although his background and that of his staff may be—and probably is—in elementary and secondary education, he must make decisions and judgments concerning whether or not the inductive approach to short-story analysis is important enough to authorize the adoption of a supplementary text for English 1B. Inevitably, his decisions are either arbitrary or they are simply ratifications of what has, in effect, been decided by the only people who really understand the problem—members of the college staff. If the decisions of such a central administrator are arbitrary, they are obviously indefensible; if he merely rubber-stamps decisions actually made on the college-level, he is, to be sure, doing less damage. But he is certainly rendering inefficient the development of the college curriculum, and he is also costing the college money. In Long Beach, for example, the City College pays 17 per cent of the salary of the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction.

Junior college technical training programs are needlessly complicated by unified-district curriculum policies. For example, the typical technical training program has an advisory body comprised of vocational instructors, administrators, and representatives from the industries involved. This body convenes to develop technical programs that will realistically meet the needs of both industry and potential employees. Incongruously, this expert body must submit its proposals to the unified-district administration, where they are processed through the circuitous route of the multi-level curriculum committee system. Typically, the final decision to accept or reject a proposed technical program is made by a unified-district administrator who has no technical or industrial background. This kind of delayed and inexperienced decision making is obviously not good educational practice. Neither is it good public relations, for the representatives from industry who sit on advisory boards may be more than a little frustrated by the response they often receive from the unified-district curriculum complex. Industry representatives are quite understandably concerned at this kind of treatment. Their reactions do not contribute to community goodwill for the junior college.

Academic Standards

In addition to offering a better curriculum, the independent junior college tends to foster higher academic standards. In a unified district there is a strong tendency among members of the central administration to depress standards at the college level. Their elementary-secondary backgrounds tend to make them concerned with what they mistakenly take to be the "welfare" of the college student. They tend to concern themselves about the students' "adjustments," not his academic performance—and they tend to frown on those instructors who attempt to maintain university standards in transfer courses. Subtle pressures on the instructor, such as surveys of his grading practices, have the effect of encouraging him to "curve" his grades, exhibiting a "normal" grade distribution.

Instruction

Often, in a unified district, the instructor is the type who will yield to such pressure, for, after all, he was recruited by administrators who are not oriented to higher-education standards. And quite often he may be recruited from within the unified district. High school teachers, after long and admirable service, are often "rewarded" by a "promotion" to the junior college. Such teachers, needless to say, may not be the ideal candidates for an instructorship in higher education. In such cases, the student once again finds himself in a college classroom with his old secondary teacher—or one like him. Junior colleges that were formerly in unified districts and are now independent report that the quality of their faculty has improved. An example is Compton College, which became an independent district over a decade ago. In a study made of faculty attitudes since separation, it was discovered that 76 per cent of the staff felt that the quality of the faculty had improved since separation. The student is, of course, the beneficiary of improved instruction.

One of the major advantages of a junior college with its own district is its ability to attract superior instructors. Such instructors do not wish to enter unified districts, where they will have to submit to such elementary-secondary rules and requirements as "institute" sessions and first-aid classes. Neither do they like to be "supervised" by administrators with secondary and elementary backgrounds. The Compton Report indicates that library facilities, administrative-faculty relationships, and rules and regulations all have improved in the independent district. Further, the Report indicates that the instructors now enjoy more academic freedom and more time off for professional meetings. They are, in a word, treated like staff members in an institution of higher education, not as high school teachers assigned to "grades thirteen and fourteen."

Another reason the independent district has a higher-quality faculty is that there are no in-district "promotions" of loyal and deserving high school teachers. In the Long Beach Unified School District, for example, the City College English Department has, in the past seven years, received 90 per cent of its new instructors from the local high schools. This is not to say that these teachers are unworthy or incompetent. It does indicate, however, the

strong tendency of administrators, preoccupied with their careers in the unified district, to avoid exploring other sources for new instructors. After all, most of the college administrators in a unified district were themselves "promoted" from high schools.

John Lombardi, president of the Los Angeles City College, in a paper for the coordinating Council of Higher Education wrote:

> Administrators believe that junior colleges in independent districts have a wider geographical source of candidates than those attached to high school or unified districts because they are not bound by local policies to select or give preference to high school teachers who, failing to get appointments in the junior college, tend to be disgruntled and antagonistic towards the junior college.

He also wrote:

> Separation from the secondary school at the local level is proceeding smoothly because no major or fundamental changes are required in patterns of district organization, in the principle of financial support, or in the practices. Often all that is involved in the changeover is the election of a new board, selection of some new personnel, and the equitable allocation of assets and liabilities.

The independent junior college, no longer drained financially by a central administration in a unified district, is also in a position to allocate a greater portion of its budget to instructors' salaries. Again, the result is that such institutions attract a higher-quality applicant than do the junior colleges that are tied to an elementary-secondary salary schedule. For example, as independent institutions the junior colleges at Santa Monica and San Diego could reclaim their fair share of existing tax revenues now being diverted to other educational levels. This revenue could be used to raise salaries *without* raising taxes.

College Environment

The Compton Report also indicated that the general college environment was improved by separation. One hundred per cent of the 40 instructors who answered the Compton questionnaire reported that the students had more freedom in the independent district, and 83 per cent felt that the reputation of the college in the community had improved. In order to be "fair," the central administration in a unified district often feels that it is necessary to impose the same rules and regulations on the college campus that exist elsewhere in the district. As a result, the college student in a unified district is still a "pupil" to the central administration. Inevitably, such an attitude communicates itself to the college environment—and the student senses his secondary-education status.

Again, the Compton Report indicates that better students may be attracted to a junior college with its own district. Thirty-eight per cent of the instructors felt that the college was receiving better students than it did when part of the unified district, with 34 per cent reporting no change.

Conclusion

Rebuttal of Arguments

Those who argue that unified districts are superior to independent ones usually attempt to cite financial and curricular reasons for their position. Yet we have shown here that unified-district junior colleges do not enjoy a budgetary advantage. On the contrary, the central administration of the unified district characteristically finds ways of charging the junior college for "services" that it doesn't need or use—or that it could do better itself. It is one thing to pay 100 per cent of the salaries of administrators who spend all of their time at the college—and quite another thing, for example, to expend the same budgetary allowance on 17 per cent of the salaries of administrators with elementary and secondary backgrounds, duties, and concerns.

The other main argument usually advanced has to do with "articulation," a favorite educationist term. Actually, "articulation" with the local high schools in a unified district is a myth. To a large extent the liberal arts and transfer curriculum is determined by the four-year colleges to which the students will transfer. The technical and vocational curricula are determined by similar harsh realities. Articulation of courses makes sense from the first through the twelfth grades because it is reasonable to assume that most students will remain in the same school system. If, however, the local high schools attempted to "articulate" their courses with those offered by the junior college in the unified district, they would be doing a serious disservice to students who planned to attend, for example, a state college or one of the universities.

A typical junior college—in or out of a unified district—must shape its curriculum to be compatible with the four-year colleges to which its students characteristically transfer. And a typical high school—in or out of a unified district—must do the same thing. However, in spite of the fact that there can be no "articulation" in the sense that the opponents of separation claim, the transition of students from high school to junior college is reasonably smooth. For example, the high school student from Los Angeles makes the transition to Santa Monica City College as easily as does the student from a Santa Monica high school. The unified district offers no special advantages.

There are, however, many disadvantages to the instructional program in a unified district. There are many examples of difficulties encountered in ordering supplies, films, books, etc., which indicate that centralized "services" are far from ideal. It should be possible to increase the efficiency of the junior college operation by placing decision-making power in the hands of people who devote all of their attention to the junior college.

More significant, perhaps, than the arguments against separation is the identity of the anti-separationists. These opponents of separation invariably have been administrative incumbents from large unified districts. The only support they have is that which the unified districts provide. Although these administrators may be affiliated with such groups as CTA, such organizations do not support them on this issue; and, although unified-district junior colleges are members of CJCA, that organization has not supported them. As a matter of fact, the Board of the Southwest Region of CJCA voted overwhelmingly, on March 9, 1965, to support the principle of separation.

In the past two years there have been two public hearings on the issue of separation. At the May, 1963, hearing on AB 2883 (the separation bill), the following organizations spoke in favor of independent districts: American Association of University Professors, California Federation of Teachers, California Junior College Faculty Association, and Long Beach Federation of Teachers (AFT). No opposing educational organizations were represented at the hearing. Instead, the entire opposition came from representatives of only two unified districts. At the second hearing before the interim committee on the same bill in December, 1964, spokesmen for the California Federation of Teachers and the California Junior College Faculty Association supported separation. Opposed was a single administrator—representing the Long Beach Unified School District.

At the first hearing the unified-district administrators testified that independent districts could not support themselves. At the second hearing it was admitted—and so recorded—that funds earmarked for junior colleges in unified districts are regularly diverted to elementary and secondary schools. Having yielded on the financial argument at the second hearing, the unified-district representative attempted to raise a new issue—local control. This is not, however, a valid issue because no proponent of separation is asking for any other kind of control. Just the reverse is true: proponents of separation want the junior college to have the most effective type of local control—a local board which would devote its full time and attention to the affairs of the college.

The opponents of separation, then, are not only few in number, but also they are administrative incumbents of unified districts—scarcely disinterested parties. They constitute a small minority without a single educational organization behind them. The proponents of separation, on the other hand, present themselves as an overwhelming majority enjoying the support of all state-wide faculty organizations. The majority view has been presented with extensive data and well-documented arguments. Further, the compelling logic of separation has persuaded the national press to begin speaking out in favor of independent districts. It would appear, therefore, that the burden of proof should rest with the small minority of anti-separationists comprised of unified-district administrators. Is it not time to ask *them* to refute the arguments of the majority and to set up a rationale to explain away the good reasons why the legislature has made it illegal to establish new junior colleges in unified school districts?

Summary

Much progress toward separation has already been made. In response to the spirit of the Master Plan, the junior college is taking its proper place as a segment of higher education in California. Most California junior colleges are already governed in separate districts.

The few junior colleges which do, however, remain in unified districts are large ones, and the abuses and handicaps they sustain are manifold. Funds earmarked for junior college programs are being diverted to elementary and secondary schools in the unified districts. Unified-district board members have to divide their attention between problems of higher education and grades K through 12. Unified-district administrators tend to identify strongly with the secondary level in their personnel practices and curriculum policies. The college environment has demoralizing connotations of secondary education—a "high school with ash trays," as disenchanted students often put it. Finally, the junior college faculty in a unified district is affected by the "grades-thirteen-and-fourteen" orientation of the administrators, many of whom have never taught a college class. Such administrators are quite naturally inclined to "promote" teachers from high schools in the district when new instructors are needed. Such practices will prevail until all junior colleges are independent and therefore free to embody the spirit of the Master Plan.

The Master Plan is not a plan merely; it is the law. And so long as only the letter of the law is being met, the plan will never be fully realized. The spirit of the law—the spirit of California higher education—is absent from the "school grounds" of "grades thirteen and fourteen" in the unified districts.